arXiv:0912.3312v1 [math.AC] 17 Dec 2009

Counting reducible, powerful, and relatively irreducible multivariate polynomials over finite fields

Joachim von zur Gathen
B-IT
Universität Bonn
D-53113 Bonn
Germany
`gathen@bit.uni-bonn.de`

Alfredo Viola
Instituto de Computación, Universidad de la República
Montevideo, Uruguay
Associate Member of LIPN - CNRS UMR 7030,
Université de Paris-Nord, F-93430 Villetaneuse, France
`viola@fing.edu.uy`

Konstantin Ziegler
b-it
Universität Bonn
D-53113 Bonn
Germany
`zieglerk@bit.uni-bonn.de`

December 17, 2009

Abstract

We present counting methods for some special classes of multivariate polynomials over a finite field, namely the reducible ones, the s-powerful ones (divisible by the sth power of a nonconstant polynomial), and the relatively irreducible ones (irreducible but reducible over an extension field). One approach employs generating functions, another one a combinatorial method. They yield approximations with relative errors that essentially decrease exponentially in the input size.

Keywords. multivariate polynomials, finite fields, combinatorics on polynomials, counting problems, generating functions, analytic combinatorics.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11T06, 12Y05, 05A15.

1 Introduction

Classical results describe the distribution of prime numbers and of irreducible univariate polynomials over a finite field. Randomly chosen integers up to x or polynomials of degree up to n are prime or irreducible with probability about $1/\ln x$ or $1/n$, respectively.

In two or more variables, the situation changes dramatically. Most multivariate polynomials are irreducible. This question was first studied by Leonard Carlitz, later by Stephen Cohen and others. In the bivariate case, von zur Gathen (2008) gave precise approximations with an exponentially decreasing relative error.

This paper makes the following contributions.

- Precise approximations to the number of reducible, s-powerful, and relatively irreducible polynomials, with rapidly decaying relative errors. Only reducible polynomials have been treated in the literature, usually with much larger error terms.
- Two orthogonal methodologies to obtain such bounds: generating functions and combinatorial counting.
- The classical approach of analytic combinatorics with complex coefficients leads to series that diverge everywhere (except at 0). We use symbolic coefficients, namely rational functions in a variable representing the field size, and manage to extract substantial information by coefficient comparisons.
- Our combinatorial counting follows the aforementioned approach for bivariate polynomials. It is technically slightly involved, but yields explicit constants in our error estimates.

For perspective, we also give an explicit formula which is easy to obtain but hard to use.

This version will be updated soon.

2 Notation and an exact formula

We work in the polynomial ring $F[x_1, \ldots, x_r]$ in $r \geq 2$ variables over a field F and consider polynomials with total degree equal to some nonnegative integer n:

$$P_{r,n}^{\text{all}}(F) = \{f \in F[x_1, \ldots, x_r] : \deg f = n\}.$$

The polynomials of degree at most n form an F-vector space of dimension

$$b_{r,n} = \binom{r+n}{r} = \frac{(n+r)^{\underline{r}}}{r!},$$

where the *falling factorial*, see e.g. Knuth (1992), is

$$(x+r)^{\underline{r}} = (x+r) \cdot (x+r-1) \cdots (x+1), \tag{2.1}$$

for any real x and any positive integer r. Over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ with q elements, we have

$$\#P_{r,n}^{\text{all}}(\mathbb{F}_q) = q^{b_{r,n}} - q^{b_{r,n-1}} = q^{b_{r,n}}(1 - q^{-b_{r-1,n}}).$$

The property of a certain polynomial to be reducible, squareful or relatively irreducible is shared with all polynomials associated to the given one. For counting them, it is sufficient to take one representative. We choose an arbitrary monomial order, so that the monic polynomials are those with leading coefficient 1, and write

$$P_{r,n}(F) = \{f \in P_{r,n}^{\text{all}}(F) : f \text{ is monic}\}.$$

Then

$$\#P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \frac{\#P_{r,n}^{\text{all}}(\mathbb{F}_q)}{q-1} = q^{b_{r,n}-1}\frac{1-q^{-b_{r-1,n}}}{1-q^{-1}}. \tag{2.2}$$

The product of two monic polynomials is again monic.

3 Exact counting for reducible polynomials

To study reducible polynomials, we consider the following subsets of $P_{r,n}(F)$:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{r,n}(F) &= \{f \in P_{r,n}(F) : f \text{ irreducible}\}, \\ R_{r,n}(F) &= P_{r,n}(F) \setminus I_{r,n}(F). \end{aligned}$$

Carlitz (1963) provided the first count of irreducible multivariate polynomials. In Carlitz (1965), he went on to study the fraction of irreducibles when bounds on the degrees in each variable are prescribed; see also Cohen (1968). We opt for the total degree because it has the charm of being invariant under invertible linear transformations. Gao & Lauder (2002) considered our problem in yet another model, namely where one variable occurs with maximal degree. The natural generating function (or zeta function) for the irreducible polynomials in two or more variables does not converge anywhere outside of the origin. Wan (1992) notes that this explains the lack of a simple combinatorial formula for the number of irreducible polynomials. But he gives a p-adic formula, and also a (somewhat complicated) combinatorial formula.

In the remainder of the section we will focus on $R_{r,n}(F)$ in the special case of a finite field $F = \mathbb{F}_q$ and omit it from the notation. We want to count exactly how many polynomials there are with a given factorization pattern. Our approach is to look at inclusion-exclusion from the bottom up, that is, considering each factorization pattern. We start with the simplest case, namely polynomials that have d irreducible factors, all of the same degree m and the same multiplicity e:

$$P_{r,n}(m\colon e, \#d) = \{g_1^e \cdots g_d^e \colon g_1, \ldots, g_d \in I_{r,m} \text{ pairwise distinct}\}.$$

Here d, m and e are positive integers and $n = mde$. We have

$$\#P_{r,n}(m\colon e, \#d) = \binom{\#I_{r,m}}{d}.$$

More generally, when we allow pairwise distinct multiplicities $e_1, \ldots, e_s$ for $d_1, \ldots, d_s$ irreducible factors, respectively, then $P_{r,n}(m\colon e_1, \#d_1, \ldots, e_s, \#d_s)$ consists of products of d_i factors g^{e_i}, where all $g \in I_{r,m}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ are pairwise distinct. Thus

$$\#P_{r,n}(m\colon e_1, \#d_1, \ldots, e_s\colon \#d_s) = \binom{\#I_{r,m}}{d_1, \ldots, d_s},$$

where
$$\binom{\#I_{r,m}}{d_1,\ldots,d_s} = \frac{(\#I_{r,m})!}{d_1!\cdots d_s!\,(\#I_{r,m}-(d_1+\cdots+d_s))!}$$
is a multinomial coefficient. The degree n of any polynomial in this set is $m\sum_{1\leq i\leq s} e_i d_i$. Finally, a general polynomial of degree n is described by a partition

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathbf{m}\colon \mathbf{e}, \#\mathbf{d}) = (&m_1\colon e_{11}, \#d_{11}, \ldots, e_{1s_1}, \#d_{1s_1}; \ldots; \\ &m_t\colon e_{t1}, \#d_{t1}, \ldots, e_{ts_t}, \#d_{ts_t}).\end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

of n with
$$n = \sum_{1\leq i\leq t} m_i \sum_{1\leq j\leq s_i} e_{ij} d_{ij}. \tag{3.2}$$

All m_i, e_{ij}, d_{ij} are positive integers, $m_1,\ldots,m_t$ are pairwise distinct, and for each i, $e_{i1},\ldots,e_{is_i}$ are pairwise distinct.

We write $P_{r,n}(\mathbf{m} : \mathbf{e}, \#\mathbf{d})$ for the set of polynomials in $P_{r,n}$ with exactly d_{ij} distinct irreducible factors of degree m_i and multiplicity e_{ij}. Then

$$\#P_{r,n}(\mathbf{m} : \mathbf{e}, \#\mathbf{d}) = \prod_{1\leq i\leq t} \binom{\#I_{r,m_i}}{d_{i1},\ldots,d_{is_i}}, \tag{3.3}$$

Theorem 3.4.

$$\begin{aligned}R_{r,n} &= \bigcup_{(\mathbf{m}\colon \mathbf{e},\#\mathbf{d})} P_{r,n}(\mathbf{m}\colon \mathbf{e}, \#\mathbf{d}), \\ \#R_{r,n} &= \sum_{(\mathbf{m}\colon \mathbf{e},\#\mathbf{d})} \#P_{r,n}(\mathbf{m}\colon \mathbf{e}, \#\mathbf{d}),\end{aligned}$$

where the union is disjoint and over all partitions as in (3), *except* $(\mathbf{m}\colon \mathbf{e}, \#\mathbf{d}) = (\mathbf{n}\colon \mathbf{1}, \#\mathbf{1})$ *which corresponds to the irreducible polynomials.*

Note that the multiplicities e_{ij} appear in (3) only implicitly via (3). These formulas provide an explicit way of calculating the number of irreducible polynomials inductively. Cohen (1968) notes that, compared to the univariate case, “the situation is different and much more difficult. In this case, no explicit formula [...] is available”.

Bodin (2008) gives a recursive formula for $\#I_{2,n}$ and remarks on a generalization for more than 2 variables.

The formula of Theorem 3.1 is quite impractical (and error-prone) for hand calculations already at small sizes, and also cumbersome to program. The next section presents a more elegant approach.

4 Generating functions for reducible polynomials

We now present a generating series that is easy to implement in any computer algebra system and gives exact values in lightning speed. This is modeled on an analytic combinatorial approach that is presented in Flajolet & Sedgewick (2009) by two experts who created large parts of this theory. We first recall a few general primitives from this theory that enable one to set up symbolic

Table 1: The partitions of small numbers in concise notation:

n	partitions
1	1
2	$2, 11$
3	$3, 21, 111$
4	$4, 31, 22, 211, 1111$
5	$5, 41, 32, 311, 221, 2111, 11111$
6	$6, 51, 42, 411, 33, 321, 3111, 222, 2211, 21111, 111111$

equations for generating functions starting from combinatorial specifications. Given a combinatorial object ω, the formal identity

$$\frac{1}{1-\omega} = 1 + \omega + \omega^2 + \ldots$$

generates symbolically arbitrary sequences composed of ω. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be a family of primitive combinatorial objects. Then the product

$$\mathcal{P} = \prod_{\omega \in \mathcal{I}} (1-\omega)^{-1}$$

generates the class of all finite multisets of elements taken from $\mathcal{I}$.

We take $\mathcal{I}$ to be the collection of all monic irreducible polynomials. Then, by the unique factorization property of polynomials, $\mathcal{P}$ generates the collection of all monic polynomials. Let z be a variable, and $|\omega|$ be the total degree of the polynomial ω. The substitution $\omega \mapsto z^{|\omega|}$ in formal sums and products of objects gives rise to counting generating functions. Since $\mathcal{I}$ is identified with the formal sum $\sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{I}} \omega$, the corresponding power series is

$$\mathsf{I} = \sum_{\omega \in \mathcal{I}} z^{|\omega|} = \sum_{n \geq 1} \mathcal{I}_n z^n,$$

where $\mathcal{I}_n = \# I_{r,n}$ is the number of polynomials in $\mathcal{I}$ of total degree n. In a similar way, the generating function for all monic polynomials is

$$\mathsf{P} = \prod_{\omega \in \mathcal{I}} \left(1 - z^{|\omega|}\right)^{-1} = \prod_{n \geq 1} (1 - z^n)^{-\mathcal{I}_n} = \sum_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{P}_n z^n. \tag{4.1}$$

We now apply the ideas of this theory in a different setting. For multivariate polynomials over a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$, the natural generating functions diverge in all points except 0. We replace the usual complex analytic scenario, where, e.g., P is a power series with complex coefficients, by a symbolic setting. Namely, for any r and n, we consider $\mathcal{P}_n$ to be a polynomial in a variable q with integer coefficients. Substituting a prime power q for q yields the integer $\# P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Allowing, more generally, rational functions in q leads to power series in $\mathbb{Q}(\mathsf{q})[\![z]\!]$. Thus now

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \mathsf{q}^{b_{r,n}-1} \frac{1 - \mathsf{q}^{-b_{r-1,n}}}{1 - \mathsf{q}^{-1}} \in \mathbb{Q}[q], \tag{4.2}$$

in accordance with (2), and similarly for $\mathcal{I}_n$. Interpreting the second product in (4) as $\exp\Big(-\sum_{n\geq 1}\mathcal{I}_n(1-z^n)\Big)$, taking logarithms, and applying Möbius inversion, with the Möbius function μ, yields

$$\log \mathsf{P} = \sum_{k\geq 1} \frac{\mathsf{I}(z^k)}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathsf{I} = \sum_{k\geq 1} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \log \mathsf{P}(z^k). \tag{4.3}$$

P is known, and we take the second equation in (4) as the definition of I. Similarly, $\mathsf{R} = \mathsf{P} - \mathsf{I}$ is the series of reducible polynomials. The coefficients of I can be calculated by expanding the logarithm and equating the appropriate powers of z on both sides.

An 8-line Maple implementation of the resulting algorithm is described in Figure 1. It is easy to program and execute and was used to calculate the number of bivariate reducible polynomials in von zur Gathen (2008, Table 2.1).

```
allp := proc(z,n,r) local i: options remember:
    sum('simplify((q^binomial(i+r,r)-q^binomial(i+r-1,r))/
                                            (q-1))*z^i',i=0..n):
end:

reducible := proc(n,r) local k: options remember:
    convert(taylor(allp(z,n,r)-sum('mobius(k)/k*log(allp(z^k,n,r))',
                                     k=1..n),z,n+1),polynom):
end:
```

Figure 1: Maple program to compute the generating function of the number of reducible polynomials in r variables up to degree n.

For $f \in \mathbb{Q}(\mathsf{q})$, $\deg f$ is the degree of f, that is, the numerator degree minus the denominator degree. The appearance of $O(\mathsf{q}^{-1})$ in an equation means the existence of some f with negative degree that makes the equation valid. The charm of our approach is that we obtain results for any ("fixed") r and n. If a term $O(\mathsf{q}^{-1})$ appears, then we have an asymptotic result for growing prime powers q. We denote by $[z^n]\mathsf{F} \in \mathbb{Q}(\mathsf{q})$ the coefficient of z^n in $\mathsf{F} \in \mathbb{Q}(\mathsf{q})[\![z]\!]$.

Lemma 4.4. *(i) For $i, j \geq 0$, we have $\deg(\mathcal{P}_i \cdot \mathcal{P}_j) \leq \deg \mathcal{P}_{i+j}$.*

(ii) For $1 \leq k \leq n/2$, the sequence of integers $\deg(\mathcal{P}_k \cdot \mathcal{P}_{n-k})$ is strictly decreasing in k.

Proof. (i) The claim is equivalent to the binomial inequality

$$\binom{r+i}{r} + \binom{r+j}{r} - 1 \leq \binom{r+i+j}{r},$$

which is easily seen by considering the choices of r-element subsets from a set with $r+i+j$ elements.

(ii) Using (4), we define a function u as

$$u_{r,n}(k) = \deg(\mathcal{P}_k \cdot \mathcal{P}_{n-k}) = \binom{r+k}{r} + \binom{r+n-k}{r} - 2. \tag{4.5}$$

We extend the domain of $u_{r,n}(k)$ from positive integers k between 1 and $n/2$ to real numbers k by means of falling factorials as introduced in (2)

$$u_{r,n}(k) = \frac{(k+r)^{\underline{r}}}{r!} + \frac{(n-k+r)^{\underline{r}}}{r!} - 2.$$

It is sufficient to show that the affine transformation $\bar{u}$ with

$$\bar{u}(k) = r! \cdot (u_{r,n}(k) + 2) = (k+r)^{\underline{r}} + (n-k+r)^{\underline{r}}$$

is strictly decreasing. The first derivative with respect to k is

$$\bar{u}'(k) = \sum_{1 \le i \le r} \Big((k+1) \cdots \widehat{(k+i)} \cdots (k+r) \\ - (n-k+1) \cdots \widehat{(n-k+i)} \cdots (n-k+r) \Big) .$$

Since $(k+j) < (n-k+j)$ for $1 \le j \le r$, each difference is negative, and so is $\bar{u}'(k)$.

□

Theorem 4.6. *Let* $r, n \ge 2$, *and*

$$\rho_{r,n}(\mathsf{q}) = \mathsf{q}^{\binom{n+r-1}{r}+r-1} \frac{1-\mathsf{q}^{-r}}{(1-\mathsf{q}^{-1})^2} \in \mathbb{Q}(\mathsf{q}), \tag{4.7}$$

$$\alpha_n = \begin{cases} 1/2 & \textit{if } n = 4, \\ 1 & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then for $n \ge 4$

$$\mathcal{R}_n = \rho_{r,n}(\mathsf{q}) \cdot \Big(1 + \alpha_n \mathsf{q}^{-\binom{n+r-2}{r-1}+r(r+1)/2}(1 + O(\mathsf{q}^{-1}))\Big),$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_2 = \frac{\rho_{r,2}(\mathsf{q})}{2}\left(1 - \mathsf{q}^{-r-1}\right),$$
$$\mathcal{R}_3 = \rho_{r,3}(\mathsf{q})\left(1 - \mathsf{q}^{-r} + \mathsf{q}^{-r(r-1)/2} \frac{1 - 2\mathsf{q}^{-r} + 2\mathsf{q}^{-2r-1} - \mathsf{q}^{-2r-2}}{3(1-\mathsf{q}^{-1})}\right).$$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{F} = \mathsf{P} - 1$. The Taylor expansion of $\log(1 + \mathsf{F}(z^k))$ in (4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{I} &= \sum_{k \ge 1} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \sum_{i \ge 1} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{\mathsf{F}(z^k)^i}{i} \\ &= \mathsf{F} + \sum_{i \ge 2} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{\mathsf{F}^i}{i} + \sum_{k \ge 2} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \sum_{i \ge 1} (-1)^{i+1} \frac{\mathsf{F}(z^k)^i}{i}, \\ \mathsf{R} = \mathsf{P} - \mathsf{I} &= 1 + \sum_{i \ge 2} (-1)^i \frac{\mathsf{F}^i}{i} + \sum_{k \ge 2} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \sum_{i \ge 1} (-1)^i \frac{\mathsf{F}(z^k)^i}{i}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{R}_2 = [z^2]\mathsf{R}$, we directly find $\mathcal{R}_2 = ({\mathcal{P}_1}^2 + \mathcal{P}_1)/2$. Similarly, $\mathcal{R}_3 = \mathcal{P}_2\mathcal{P}_1 - ({\mathcal{P}_1}^3 - \mathcal{P}_1)/3$, which implies the claim.

When $n \geq 4$, then the main contribution of $\mathcal{R}_n = [z^n]\mathsf{R}$ comes from the term $i = 2$ in the first sum. For $n = 4$, the main contribution is $\mathcal{P}_3\mathcal{P}_1 + {\mathcal{P}_2}^2/2$, giving the asymptotic expansion stated in the theorem using the bounds of Lemma 4.1. For $n \geq 5$ it leads to $\mathcal{R}_n \sim (2\mathcal{P}_{n-1}\mathcal{P}_1 + 2P_{n-2}\mathcal{P}_2)/2 = \mathcal{P}_{n-1}\mathcal{P}_1(1 + P_{n-2}\mathcal{P}_2/(\mathcal{P}_{n-1}\mathcal{P}_1))$. The error estimate follows by taking the main term in $P_{n-2}\mathcal{P}_2/(\mathcal{P}_{n-1}\mathcal{P}_1)$. ☐ ☐

Bodin (2008, Theorem 7) shows (in our notation)

$$1 - \frac{\#I_{r,n}}{\#P_{r,n}} \sim q^{-b_{r-1,n}-r}\frac{1-q^{-r}}{1-q^{-1}}.$$

Hou & Mullen (2009) provide results for $\#I_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. These do not yield error bounds for the approximation of $\#R_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Bodin (2009) claims a result similar to Theorem 4.2, for values of n that tend to infinity and with an unspecified multiplicative factor of the error term.

5 Explicit bounds for reducible polynomials

We now describe a third approach to counting the reducible polynomials. The derivation is somewhat more involved. The payoff of this additional effort are explicit relative error bounds in Theorem 5.2, replacing the asymptotic $O(\mathsf{q}^{-1})$ by bounds like $3q^{-m}$ for some explicit positive integer m.

We consider, for integers $1 \leq k < n$, the multiplication map

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{r,n,k} \colon P_{r,k} \times P_{r,n-k} &\longrightarrow P_{r,n} \\ (g,h) &\longmapsto g \cdot h. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, we assume $k \leq n/2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \#\operatorname{im}\mu_{r,n,k} &\leq \#P_{r,k} \cdot \#P_{r,n-k} \\ &= q^{u_{r,n}(k)}\frac{(1-q^{-b_{r-1,k}})(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n-k}})}{(1-q^{-1})^2} \\ &< q^{u_{r,n}(k)}\frac{1-q^{-b_{r-1,k}}}{(1-q^{-1})^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.1}$$

with $u_{r,n}(k) = b_{r,k} + b_{r,n-k} - 2$ as in ((ii)). The asymptotic behavior of this upper bound is dominated by the behavior of $u_{r,n}(k)$. From Lemma 4.1(i) we know that for any $r \geq 2$ and $n \geq 2$, $u_{r,n}(k)$ is strictly decreasing for $1 \leq k \leq n/2$. As $u_{r,n}(k)$ takes only integral values for integers k we conclude that

$$\sum_{2\leq k\leq n/2} q^{u_{r,n}(k)} < q^{u_{r,n}(2)}\sum_{k\geq 0} q^{-k} = \frac{q^{u_{r,n}(2)}}{1-q^{-1}}. \tag{5.2}$$

Proposition 5.3. *In the notation of Theorem 4.2, we have:*

(i) For $n \geq 1$

$$\#R_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \rho_{r,n}(q)\left(1 + C''_n q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+b_{r-1,2}}\right)$$

with

$$C''_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \in \{1,2,3\}, \\ 8/3 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(ii) For $n \geq 2$

$$\#R_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \rho_{r,n}(q)\left(1 - C'_n q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+r}\right),$$

with

$$C'_n = \begin{cases} 1/4 & \textit{if } n = 2, \\ 9/4 & \textit{if } n \in \{3,4\}, \\ 59/12 & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(iii) For $n \geq 1$

$$\#I_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \#P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)\left(1 - B'_n q^{-b_{r-1,n}+r}\right),$$

where

$$B'_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \textit{if } n = 1, \\ 2 & \textit{if } n \in \{2,3\}, \\ 14/3 & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We start with the proof of (i). Observing

$$R_{r,n} = \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq n/2} \operatorname{im} \mu_{r,n,k}, \tag{5.4}$$

we find

$$\#R_{r,n} \leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n/2} \# \operatorname{im} \mu_{r,n,k}$$

and using inequality (5)

$$\#R_{r,n} \leq \frac{1}{(1-q^{-1})^2} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n/2} q^{u_{r,n}(k)}(1 - q^{-b_{r-1,k}}). \tag{5.5}$$

For this sum we have with (5)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n/2} q^{u_{r,n}(k)}(1 - q^{-b_{r-1,k}}) &= q^{u_{r,n}(1)}(1 - q^{-r}) + \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n/2} q^{u_{r,n}(k)}(1 - q^{-b_{r-1,k}}) \qquad (5.6) \\ &< q^{u_{r,n}(1)}(1 - q^{-r}) + \frac{q^{u_{r,n}(2)}}{1 - q^{-1}} \\ &= q^{u_{r,n}(1)}(1 - q^{-r})\left(1 + \frac{q^{-u_{r,n}(1) + u_{r,n}(2)}}{(1 - q^{-1})(1 - q^{-r})}\right). \end{aligned}$$

With $u_{r,n}(1) = b_{r,n-1} + r - 1$ and $-u_{r,n}(1) + u_{r,n}(2) = -b_{r-1,n-1} + b_{r-1,2}$, we conclude:

$$\begin{aligned} \#R_{r,n} &\leq \frac{q^{b_{r,n-1}+r-1}(1 - q^{-r})}{(1 - q^{-1})^2}\left(1 + \frac{q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+b_{r-1,2}}}{(1 - q^{-1})(1 - q^{-r})}\right) \\ &= \rho_{r,n}(q)\left(1 + \frac{q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+b_{r-1,2}}}{(1 - q^{-1})(1 - q^{-r})}\right). \end{aligned}$$

We note that the sum on the right-hand side of (5) is empty for $n \leq 3$ and furthermore that

$$\frac{1}{(1-q^{-1})(1-q^{-r})} \leq \frac{8}{3} < 3$$

for all $q, r \geq 2$. This proves (i).

We proceed with (iii). For linear polynomials the question for the number of irreducible ones is easily answered by the fact that $I_{r,1} = P_{r,1}$. Therefore (iii) holds for $n = 1$ if we choose $B'_1 = 0$. For $n \geq 2$, using (i)

$$\begin{aligned}
\#I_{r,n} &= \#P_{r,n} - \#R_{r,n} \\
&\geq \#P_{r,n} \left(1 - \rho_{r,n}(q)(1 + C''_n q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+b_{r-1,2}})/(\#P_{r,n})\right) \\
&= \#P_{r,n} \left(1 - q^{-b_{r-1,n}+r} \frac{(1 + C''_n q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+b_{r-1,2}})(1-q^{-r})}{(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n}})(1-q^{-1})}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

And with $(1-q^{-r})/(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n}}) < 1$ finally

$$\#I_{r,n} > \#P_{r,n} \left(1 - q^{-b_{r-1,n}+r} \frac{(1 + C''_n q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+b_{r-1,2}})}{(1-q^{-1})}\right).$$

For (iii) to hold it is therefore sufficient to require

$$\frac{1 + C''_n q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+b_{r-1,2}}}{1-q^{-1}} \leq B'_n$$

for all $n \geq 2$. For $n = 2$ and $n = 3$, where $C''_n = 0$, choosing $B'_n = 2$ is enough. For $n \geq 4$ the exponent $-b_{r-1,n-1} + b_{r-1,2}$ is decreasing in r and n. It is furthermore always non-positive and hence the fraction is also decreasing in q. Therefore the maximal value is achieved for $n = 4$, $r = 2$ and $q = 2$ resulting in $14/3$ as a lower bound for B'_n.

We conclude with the proof of (ii). From (5) follows

$$\#R_{r,n} \geq \# \operatorname{im} \mu_{r,n,1}. \tag{5.7}$$

Since the number of polynomials of degree n with a linear factor is bounded from below by the number of linear factors multiplied by the number of irreducible polynomials of degree $n-1$ we can continue using (iii)

$$\begin{aligned}
\#R_{r,n} &\geq \#P_{r,1} \cdot \#I_{r,n-1} \\
&\geq q^{b_{r,1}-1} \frac{1-q^{-r}}{1-q^{-1}} \cdot \#P_{r,n-1} \left(1 - B'_{n-1} q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+r}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for all $n \geq 2$. Using the definition of $\rho_{r,n}(q)$ in (4.2) this shows

$$\begin{aligned}
\#R_{r,n} &\geq \rho_{r,n}(q)(1 - q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}}) \left(1 - B'_{n-1} q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+r}\right). \\
&\geq \rho_{r,n}(q)(1 - C'_n q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+r}),
\end{aligned}$$

where we choose

$$C'_n \geq q^{-r} + B'_{n-1}.$$

□

Before we combine the upper bound (i) and the lower bound (iii) of Proposition 5.1 for $\#R_{r,n}$, we take a closer look at the maximum of the relative error terms:

$$\max(C'_n q^{-r(r-1)/2}, C''_n) \cdot q^{-b_{r-1,n-1}+b_{r-1,2}}.$$

For some very small degrees n this is insufficient. For $n = 2$ the exponent is $(r-1)r/2$, thus at least 1 and increasing with r. For $n = 3$ the error bound is $C'_3 q^{-r(r-1)/2}$ which is at most $9/(4q)$, while for $n = 4$ it reduces to $C''_4 q^{-(r-1)r(r+1)/6}$ which is at most $8/(3q)$. For $n \geq 5$ the error is strictly decreasing with n and r and at most $8/(3q^2)$.

Theorem 5.8. *In the notation of Theorem 4.2 we have for* $n \geq 4$

$$|\#R_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \rho_{r,n}(q)| \leq \rho_{r,n}(q) \cdot 3q^{-\binom{n+r-2}{r-1}+r(r+1)/2},$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \#R_{r,2}(\mathbb{F}_q) &= \frac{\rho_{r,2}(q)}{2} \cdot \left(1 - q^{-r-1)}\right), \\ |\#R_{r,3}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \rho_{r,3}(q)| &\leq \rho_{r,3}(q) \cdot 2q^{-r(r-1)/2}, \end{aligned}$$

for all $q \geq 2$.

Proof. For $n = 2$ we obtain from the recursion formula of Theorem 3.1

$$\begin{aligned} \#R_{r,2} &= \#I_{r,1} + \#I_{r,1}(\#I_{r,1} - 1)/2 \\ &= \#I_{r,1} \cdot (\#I_{r,1} + 1)/2. \end{aligned}$$

With $\#I_{r,1} = \#P_{r,1}$ this becomes

$$\#R_{r,2} = \frac{q(q^r - 1)(q^{r+1} - 1)}{2(q-1)^2} = \frac{\rho_{r,2}(q)}{2} \cdot (1 - q^{-(r+1)}).$$

For $n = 3$, the upper bound of Proposition 5.1(i) gives

$$\#R_{r,3} \leq \rho_{r,3}(q),$$

while applying (5) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \#R_{r,3} &\geq \#P_{r,1} \cdot \#I_{r,2} \\ &= \#P_{r,1} \cdot (\#P_{r,2} - \#R_{r,2}). \end{aligned}$$

With the previous result for $n = 2$ this lower bound simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} & q^r \frac{1 - q^r}{1 - q^{-1}} \cdot \left(q^{b_{r,2}-1} \frac{1 - q^{-b_{r-1,2}}}{1 - q^{-1}} - q^{2r} \frac{1 - q^{-r}}{(1 - q^{-1})^2} \frac{1 - q^{-(r+1)}}{2} \right) \\ &= \rho_{r,3}(q) \left(1 - q^{-r(r+1)/2} - q^{-(r-1)r/2} \frac{(1 - q^{-r})(1 - q^{-(r+1)})}{2(1 - q^{-1})} \right) \\ &\geq \rho_{r,3}(q) \left(1 - 2q^{-(r-1)r/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $n = 4$, we employ the lower bound from Proposition 5.1(ii) and evaluate the upper bound of (5) directly:

$$\begin{aligned}
\#R_{r,4} &\leq \frac{1}{(1-q^{-1})^2}\left(q^{u_{r,4}(1)}(1-q^{-r}) + q^{u_{r,4}(2)}(1-q^{-r(r+1)/2})\right) \\
&= \rho_{r,4}(q)\left(1 + q^{-u_{r,4}(1)+u_{r,4}(2)}\frac{1-q^{-r(r+1)/2}}{1-q^{-r}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the fraction $(1-q^{-r(r+1)/2})/(1-q^{-r})$ is less than 3 and can even be more closely bounded by $7/6$.

The remaining case $n \geq 5$ is a direct consequence of Proposition 5.1. ☐

This result supplements the bound of Theorem 4.2, by replacing $O(\mathsf{q}^{-1})$ with 2 (for $n \geq 5$).

Remark 5.9. This fits well into the picture, described in Section 2 of von zur Gathen (2008) for $r = 2$. The family of functions described there approximates the quotient $\#R_{2,n}/\#P_{2,n}$ (using our notation). If we compare them to $\rho_{r,2}(q)/\#P_{2,n}$ we find, that they differ only by the factor $1 - q^{-n-1}$, which tends to 1 as n and q increase. Our relative error term $3q^{-n+3}$ for $r = 2$ and $n \geq 5$ is only slightly larger than the bound $2q^{-n}$ in Theorem 2.1(iii) of the paper cited.

Remark 5.10. How close is our relative error estimate to being exponentially decaying in the input size? In the general case of Theorem 5.2 it is $3q^{-b_{r-1,n}+b_{r-1,2}}$. The usual dense representation of a polynomial in r variables and of degree n requires $b_{r,n} = \binom{r+n}{r}$ monomials, each of them equipped with a coefficient from $\mathbb{F}_q$, using about $\log_2 q$ bits. Thus the total input size is about $\log_2 q \cdot b_{r,n}$ bits. This differs from $\log_2 q \cdot (b_{r-1,n-1} - b_{r-1,2})$ by a factor of

$$\frac{b_{r,n}}{b_{r-1,n-1} - b_{r-1,2}} < \frac{b_{r,n}}{\frac{1}{2}b_{r-1,n-1}} = \frac{2(n+r)(n+r-1)}{nr}.$$

Up to these polynomial differences (in the exponent), the relative error is exponentially decaying in the input size. Furthermore it is exponentially decaying in any of the parameters r, n and $\log_2 q$, when the other two are fixed.

We conclude this section with a bound on the irreducible polynomials.

Corollary 5.11. *Let $q, r \geq 2$ and $\rho_{r,n}(q)$ as in* (4.2). *We have*

$$\#I_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \#P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) - 2\rho_{r,n}(q)$$

and more precisely

$$\begin{aligned}
\#I_{r,2}(\mathbb{F}_q) &= \#P_{r,2}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \frac{\rho_{r,2}(q)}{2} \cdot \left(1 - q^{-(r+1)}\right), \\
|\#I_{r,3}(\mathbb{F}_q) - (\#P_{r,3}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \rho_{r,3}(q))| &\leq \rho_{r,3}(q) \cdot 2q^{-(r-1)r/2},
\end{aligned}$$

and for $n \geq 4$

$$|\#I_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) - (\#P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \rho_{r,n}(q))| \leq \rho_{r,n}(q) \cdot 3q^{-\binom{n+r-2}{r-1}+r(r+1)/2}.$$

Proof. The precise statements follow directly from Theorem 5.2 by application of $\#P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \#R_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) + \#I_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Note that – as remarked in the proof of the cited theorem – for $n = 4$, the constant 3 can be lowered to $7/6$. For the first claim, it is enough to note that the relative error never exceeds 1. ☐

Table 2: Exact values of $\#R_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ for small values of r, n:

n	$\#R_{3,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$
1	0
2	$(q^6 + 2\,q^5 + 3\,q^4 + 3\,q^3 + 2q^2 + q)/2$
3	$(3\,q^{12} + 6\,q^{11} + 9\,q^{10} + 8\,q^9 + 6\,q^8 + 3\,q^7 - q^6 - 3\,q^5 - 3\,q^4 + q^2 + q)/3$
4	$(4\,q^{22} + 8\,q^{21} + 12\,q^{20} + 12\,q^{19} + 14\,q^{18} + 16\,q^{17} + 18\,q^{16} + 16\,q^{15} + 10\,q^{14}$ $-13\,q^{12} - 20\,q^{11} - 20\,q^{10} - 10\,q^9 - q^8 + 6\,q^7 + 7\,q^6 + 4\,q^5 - 2\,q^3 - q^2)/4$
5	$(5\,q^{37} + 10\,q^{36} + 15\,q^{35} + 15\,q^{34} + 15\,q^{33} + 15\,q^{32} + 15\,q^{31} + 15\,q^{30} + 15\,q^{29}$ $+20\,q^{28} + 25\,q^{27} + 30\,q^{26} + 30\,q^{25} + 25\,q^{24} + 15\,q^{23} - 15\,q^{21} - 30\,q^{20}$ $-45\,q^{19} - 60\,q^{18} - 65\,q^{17} - 55\,q^{16} - 26\,q^{15} + 10\,q^{14} + 40\,q^{13} + 50\,q^{12}$ $+40\,q^{11} + 19\,q^{10} - 10\,q^8 - 10\,q^7 - 5\,q^6 - q^5 + q^3 + q^2 + q)/5$
6	$(6\,q^{58} + 12\,q^{57} + 18\,q^{56} + 18\,q^{55} + 18\,q^{54} + 18\,q^{53} + 18\,q^{52} + 18\,q^{51} + 18\,q^{50}$ $+18\,q^{49} + 18\,q^{48} + 18\,q^{47} + 18\,q^{46} + 18\,q^{45} + 18\,q^{44} + 24\,q^{43} + 30\,q^{42}$ $+36\,q^{41} + 36\,q^{40} + 30\,q^{39} + 21\,q^{38} + 6\,q^{37} - 3\,q^{36} - 6\,q^{35} - 3\,q^{34} + 3\,q^{32}$ $-6\,q^{31} - 27\,q^{30} - 60\,q^{29} - 99\,q^{28} - 128\,q^{27} - 141\,q^{26} - 132\,q^{25} - 104\,q^{24}$ $-60\,q^{23} - 3\,q^{22} + 70\,q^{21} + 144\,q^{20} + 201\,q^{19} + 203\,q^{18} + 147\,q^{17} + 51\,q^{16}$ $-45\,q^{15} - 102\,q^{14} - 105\,q^{13} - 71\,q^{12} - 27\,q^{11} + 3\,q^{10} + 14\,q^9 + 11\,q^8$ $+5\,q^7 + 3\,q^6 + 3\,q^5 + 2\,q^4 - 2\,q^3 - 2\,q^2 - q)/6$

6 Powerful polynomials

For a positive integer s, a polynomial is called *s-powerful* if it is divisible by the sth power of some nonconstant polynomial, and *s-powerfree* otherwise; it is *squarefree* if $s = 2$. Let

$$Q_{r,n,s}(F) = \{f \in P_{r,n}(F) : f \text{ is } s\text{-powerful}\}.$$

As in the previous section we restrict our attention to a finite field $F = \mathbb{F}_q$ which we omit from the notation. The exact count of Section 3 can be immediately applied to s-powerful polynomials, by taking $d_{11} = s$ in 3. Similar to Section 4, let $\mathcal{Q}_{n,s}$ denote the corresponding polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}(\mathsf{q})$.

In analogy to $u_{r,n}(k)$ we set

$$\begin{aligned} v_{r,n,s}(k) &= \deg(\mathcal{P}_k \cdot \mathcal{P}_{n-sk}) \\ &= (k+r)^{\underline{r}}/r! + (n-sk+r)^{\underline{r}}/r! - 2. \end{aligned}$$

We immediately extend the range of definition for $v_{r,n,s}(k)$ from integral to real k. In contrast to $u_{r,n}(k)$ this function is not monotone in k anymore.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $r \geq 2$ and $n \geq s \geq 2$.*

(i) The function $v_{r,n,s}(k)$ is convex for $1 \leq k \leq n/s$.

(ii) The value

$$v_{r,n,s}(1) = b_{r,n-s} + r - 1.$$

is maximal among all $v_{r,n,s}(k)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n/s$.

(iii) Let $r \geq 2$ and $n \geq s \geq 2$. If $(n,s) \neq (6,2)$, then

$$v_{r,n,s}(2) \geq v_{r,n,s}(k)$$

for all integers $2 \leq k \leq n/s$. If $n = 6$ and $s = 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} v_{r,6,2}(2) &= v_{r,6,2}(3) + 1 \quad \textit{for } r = 2, \\ v_{r,6,2}(2) &< v_{r,6,2}(3) \quad \textit{for } r \geq 3. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We switch to the affine transformation

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}(k) &= r! \cdot (v_{r,n,s}(k) + 2) \\ &= (k+r)^{\underline{r}} + (n - sk + r)^{\underline{r}} \end{aligned}$$

which shows the same behavior as $v_{r,n,s}$ concerning convexity and maximality.

The convexity of $\bar{v}(k)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n/s$ follows directly from

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}''(k) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i,j \leq r \\ i \neq j}} \Big(&(k+1) \cdots \widehat{(k+i)} \cdots \widehat{(k+j)} \cdots (k+r) \\ &+ s^2 (n-sk+1) \cdots \widehat{(n-sk+i)} \cdots \widehat{(n-sk+j)} \cdots (n-sk+r) \Big) \\ = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i,j \leq r \\ i \neq j}} &\frac{(k+r)^{\underline{r}}}{(k+i)(k+j)} + s^2 \frac{(n-sk+r)^{\underline{r}}}{(n-sk+i)(n-sk+j)} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

Concerning the maximality of $\bar{v}(1)$ among all $\bar{v}(k)$ for $1 \leq k \leq n/s$, note that by convexity it is sufficient to show that

$$\bar{v}(1) \geq \bar{v}(n/s).$$

For $n \in \{s, s+1\}$, the only admissable value is $k = 1$ and the claim is trivially true.

For $n \geq s+2$, we get $n \geq s + 1 + \frac{1}{s-1}$ and

$$(n - s + j) - (n/s + j) \geq 0$$

for $1 \leq j \leq r$. This proves

$$(n - s + r)^{\underline{r}} - (n/s)^{\underline{r}} \geq 0,$$

and subsequently

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}(1) - \bar{v}(n/s) &= (r+1)! + (n-s+r)^{\underline{r}} - r! - (n/s + r)^{\underline{r}} \\ &= r \cdot r! + (n-s+r)^{\underline{r}} - (n/s+r)^{\underline{r}} \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

For the claims of (iii) we consider the difference $\bar{v}(2) - \bar{v}(n/s)$. For $(n,s) \neq (6,2)$, note again, that by convexity proving this difference nonnegative is sufficient.

First, if $n \geq 2s^2/(s-1)$, then $n - 2s \geq n/s$, so that

$$(n - 2s + i) \geq n/s + i$$

for all i and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}(2) - \bar{v}(n/s) &= (r+2)!/2 + (n-2s+r)^{\underline{r}} - (n/s+r)^{\underline{r}} - r! \\ &> (n-2s+r)^{\underline{r}} - (n/s+r)^{\underline{r}} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the claim.

Second, if $n < 2s^2/(s-1)$ and $s \geq 3$, then $n/s < 3$ making the claim trivially true, since there is at most one admissable integral value for k between 2 and n/s. The same argument holds for $s = 2$ and $n/s < 3$.

Finally, the case $s = 2$ and $n < 2s^2/(s-1)$, but $n/s \geq 3$ is left. We have $6 \leq n < 8$, and compute directly

$$v_{r,7,2}(2) - v_{r,7,2}(3) = \frac{1}{2} r(r+1) > 0$$

and

$$v_{r,6,2}(2) - v_{r,6,2}(3) = -\frac{1}{6}(r-3)(r+1)(r+2) - 1 \begin{cases} = 1 & \text{for } r = 2 \\ < 0 & \text{for } r \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

□

The generating function approach of Section 4 yields the following result.

Theorem 6.2. *Let $r \geq 2$, $n \geq s \geq 2$, and let*

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{r,n,s}(\mathsf{q}) &= \mathsf{q}^{\binom{n-s+r}{r}+r-1} \frac{(1-\mathsf{q}^{-r})(1-\mathsf{q}^{-\binom{n+r-s-1}{r-1}})}{(1-\mathsf{q}^{-1})^2} \in \mathbb{Q}(\mathsf{q}), \\ \delta &= \binom{n-s+r}{r} - \binom{n-2s+r}{r} - \frac{r(r+1)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\delta > 0$, and we have

$$\mathcal{Q}_{n,s} = \begin{cases} \eta_{r,n,s}(\mathsf{q})(1 - \mathsf{q}^{-\delta}(1 + O(\mathsf{q}^{-1}))) & \textit{if } (n,s) \neq (6,2), \\ \eta_{r,n,s}(\mathsf{q})(1 - \mathsf{q}^{-\binom{r+3}{4}-r}(1 + O(\mathsf{q}^{-1}))) & \textit{if } (n,s) = (6,2). \end{cases}$$

Proof. Let $\mathsf{S} = \sum_{n\geq 1} \mathcal{S}_n z^n$ be the generating function for the s-free polynomials. As a consequence $\#Q_{r,n,s}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{S}_n$, where $\mathcal{P}_n$ is given by equation (2). Any polynomial f factors uniquely as $f = p\, t^s$ where p is a s-free polynomial and t an arbitrary polynomial. This gives rise to the identity $\mathsf{P} = \mathsf{S} \cdot \mathsf{P}(z^s)$. As a consequence after equating powers of z in both sides of the equation we have the identity:

$$\mathcal{P}_n = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n/s} \mathcal{S}_{n-is} \mathcal{P}_i.$$

It can be proven by induction and Lemma 6.1 that for $n \geq s$, $\mathcal{S}_n \sim \mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{P}_{n-s}\mathcal{P}_1 - \mathcal{P}_{n-2s}\mathcal{P}_2$, where we use the fact that $\mathcal{P}_0 = 1$. As a consequence, for

Table 3: Exact values of $\#Q_{r,n,s}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ for small values of r, n, s:

n	$\#Q_{2,n,3}(\mathbb{F}_q)$
4	$q^4 + 2\,q^3 + q^2$
5	$q^7 + 2\,q^6 + 2\,q^5 + q^4$
6	$q^{11} + 2\,q^{10} + 2\,q^9 + 2\,q^8 + q^7 + q^5 - q^3 - q^2$
7	$q^{16} + 2\,q^{15} + 2\,q^{14} + 2\,q^{13} + 2\,q^{12} + q^{11} + q^7 + q^6 - q^5 - 2\,q^4 - q^3$
n	$\#Q_{3,n,2}(\mathbb{F}_q)$
3	$q^6 + 2\,q^5 + 3\,q^4 + 2\,q^3 + q^2$
4	$q^{12} + 2\,q^{11} + 3\,q^{10} + 4\,q^9 + 4\,q^8 + 4\,q^7 + 2\,q^6 - 2\,q^4 - 2\,q^3 - q^2$
n	$\#Q_{3,n,3}(\mathbb{F}_q)$
4	$q^6 + 2\,q^5 + 3\,q^4 + 2\,q^3 + q^2$
5	$q^{12} + 2\,q^{11} + 3\,q^{10} + 3\,q^9 + 3\,q^8 + 3\,q^7 + 2\,q^6 + q^5$

$n \geq s$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_n - \mathcal{S}_n = \mathcal{Q}_{n,s} &= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/s \rfloor} \mathcal{S}_{n-is}\mathcal{P}_s \sim \mathcal{P}_{n-s}\mathcal{P}_1 + \mathcal{P}_{n-2s}\mathcal{P}_2 \\ &= \mathcal{P}_{n-s}\mathcal{P}_1 \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{P}_{n-2s}\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{P}_{n-s}\mathcal{P}_1}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The result follows after using (2), and then taking the main order term in $\frac{\mathcal{P}_{n-2s}\mathcal{P}_2}{\mathcal{P}_{n-s}\mathcal{P}_1}$. Notice that when $n < s$ then both $\mathcal{P}_{n-s}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{n-2s}$ are equal to 0, leading to the correct result (there is no s-power-ful polynomial of degree $n < s$). Moreover, when $s \leq n < 2s$ then $\mathcal{P}_{n-s} = 0$, and so we obtain the exact result $\mathcal{Q}_{n,s} = \mathcal{P}_{n-s}\mathcal{P}_1$.

When $(n, s) = (6, 2)$, the second order contribution does not come from $\mathcal{P}_{n-2s}\mathcal{P}_2 = {\mathcal{P}_2}^2$ but from $\mathcal{P}_{n-3s}\mathcal{P}_3 = \mathcal{P}_3$. As a consequence the error term comes from $\frac{\mathcal{P}_3}{\mathcal{P}_{n-s}\mathcal{P}_1}$ instead of $\frac{{\mathcal{P}_2}^2}{\mathcal{P}_{n-s}\mathcal{P}_1}$ □

The exact values for $\#Q_{2,n,2}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ were already given in von zur Gathen (2008, Table 3.1). We extend this in Table 3.

For the combinatorial approach consider for any integer $1 \leq k \leq n/s$, the map

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{r,n,k} \colon P_{r,k} \times P_{r,n-sk} &\to P_{r,n} \\ (g, h) &\mapsto g^s h.\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$Q_{r,n,s} = \bigcup_{1 \leq k \leq n/s} \operatorname{im} \sigma_{r,n,k}. \tag{6.3}$$

The size of $\operatorname{im} \sigma_{r,n,k}$ is indicated by $v_{r,n,s}(k)$ as defined in Lemma 6.1.

Corollary 6.4. *Let $q, r \geq 2$ and $n \geq s \geq 2$. If $(n,s) \neq (6,2)$, then*

$$\sum_{2 \leq k \leq n/s} q^{v_{r,n,s}(k)} \leq q^{v_{r,n,s}(2)} 2 \sum_{k \geq 0} q^{-k} = \frac{2q^{v_{r,n,s}(2)}}{1-q^{-1}}.$$

If $n = 6$ and $s = 2$, then

$$\sum_{2 \leq k \leq n/s} q^{v_{r,6,2}(k)} \leq \begin{cases} 2q^{v_{r,6,2}(3)+1} & \text{for } r = 2, \\ 2q^{v_{r,6,2}(3)} & \text{for } r \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 6.5. *Let $r \geq 2$, $n \geq s \geq 2$, $\eta_{r,n,s}(q)$ and δ as in Theorem 6.2.*

(i) If $(n,s) \neq (6,2)$, then

$$\#Q_{r,n,s}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \left(1 + D''_{n,s} q^{-\delta}\right),$$

where

$$\delta = v_{r,n,s}(1) - v_{r,n,s}(2) = \binom{n+r-s}{n-s} - \binom{n+r-2s}{n-2s} - r(r-1)/2$$

and

$$D''_{n,s} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } n < 2s, \\ 7/6 & \text{for } 2s \leq n < 3s, \\ 16/3 & \text{for } 3s \leq n. \end{cases}$$

(ii) If $n = 6$ and $s = 2$, then

$$\#Q_{r,6,2}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \eta_{r,6,2}(q) \left(1 + D''_{6,2} q^{-\tilde{\delta}}\right),$$

where

$$\tilde{\delta} = v_{r,6,2}(1) - v_{r,6,2}(3) - 1 = \binom{r+3}{r-1} + r - 1$$

and $D''_{6,2} = 8/3$.

Proof. Starting from (6) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\#Q_{r,n,s} &\leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n/s} \# \operatorname{im} \sigma_{r,n,k} \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n/s} \#P_{r,k} \cdot \#P_{r,n-sk} \\
&= \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n/s} q^{v_{r,n,s}(k)} \frac{(1-q^{-b_{r-1,k}})(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n-sk}})}{(1-q^{-1})^2}, \\
&= \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \left(1 + q^{-v_{r,n,s}(1)} \cdot \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n/s} q^{v_{r,n,s}(k)} \frac{(1-q^{-b_{r-1,k}})(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n-sk}})}{(1-q^{-r})(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n-s}})}\right) \\
&\leq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \left(1 + q^{-v_{r,n,s}(1)} \cdot \sum_{2 \leq k \leq n/s} q^{v_{r,n,s}(k)} \frac{(1-q^{-b_{r-1,k}})}{(1-q^{-r})}\right). \qquad (6.6)
\end{aligned}$$

The sum is empty if $n < 2s$. If $2s \leq n < 3s$ the sum in (6) is equal to its only summand for the index $k = 2$. The coefficient of the power of q is now

$$\frac{1 - q^{-b_{r-1,2}}}{1 - q^{-b_{r-1,1}}} \leq \frac{1 - q^{-3}}{1 - q^{-2}} \leq \frac{7}{6}.$$

For the remaining case $n \geq 3s$, the assumption $(n, s) \neq (6, 2)$ allows us to use the approximation given in Corollary 6.3 for

$$\#Q_{r,n,s} \leq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \left(1 + \frac{2q^{-v_{r,n,s}(1)+v_{r,n,s}(2)}}{(1 - q^{-r})(1 - q^{-1})} \right). \tag{6.7}$$

We determine the constant $D''_{n,s}$ by

$$\frac{2}{(1 - q^{-r})(1 - q^{-1})} \leq \frac{16}{3}.$$

Finally, for $(n, s) = (6, 2)$ we modify the upper bound (6) according to Corollary 6.3 and obtain

$$\#Q^1_{r,6,2} \leq \eta_{r,6,2}(q) \cdot \begin{cases} \left(1 + \dfrac{2q^{-v_{r,n,s}(1)+v_{r,n,s}(3)+1}}{(1 - q^{-r})} \right) & \text{for } r = 2, \\ \left(1 + \dfrac{2q^{-v_{r,n,s}(1)+v_{r,n,s}(3)}}{(1 - q^{-r})} \right) & \text{for } r \geq 3 \end{cases}$$

and conclude with

$$\frac{2}{(1 - q^{-r})} \leq \frac{8}{3}.$$

□

Proposition 6.8. *Let $r \geq 2$, $n \geq s \geq 2$, and $\eta_{r,n,s}(q)$ as in Theorem 6.2. Then*

$$\#Q_{r,n,s}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \left(1 - D'_{n,s} q^{-\Delta} \right),$$

where

$$\Delta = b_{r,n-s} - b_{r,n-2s} - r$$

and

$$D'_{n,s} = \begin{cases} 0 & \textit{for } n < 2s, \\ 3/2 & \textit{for } 2s \leq n < 3s, \\ 31/16 & \textit{for } 3s \leq n < 4s, \\ 7/2 & \textit{for } 4s \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We use the map $\sigma_{r,n,k}$ with the largest image, namely for $k = 1$. Let $2s \leq n$ and $(n, s) \neq (8, 2)$, then $\sigma_{r,n,1}$ is injective on $I_{r,1} \times (P_{r,n-s} \setminus Q_{r,n-s,s})$.

Using $-v_{r,n-s,s}(1) + v_{r,n-s,s}(2) \leq -r \leq -2$, we find

$$\begin{align}
\#Q_{r,n,s} &\geq \operatorname{im} \sigma_{r,n,1} \notag \\
&\geq \#I_{r,1} \cdot \#(P_{r,n-s} \setminus Q_{r,n-s,s}) \tag{6.9} \\
&\geq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \cdot q^{-b_{r,n-s}+1} \frac{1-q^{-1}}{1-q^{-b_{r-1,n-s}}} \cdot (\#P_{r,n-s} - \#Q_{r,n-s,s}) \notag \\
&\geq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \Bigg(1 - q^{-b_{r,n-s}+2r} \frac{(1-q^{-r})}{(1-q^{-1})} \cdot \notag \\
&\quad \frac{(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n-2s}})}{(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n-s}})} \left(1 + D''_{n-s,s} q^{-v_{r,n-s,s}(1)+v_{r,n-s,s}(2)} \right) \Bigg) \notag \\
&\geq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \left(1 + D''_{n-s,s} q^{-v_{r,n-s,s}(1)+v_{r,n-s,s}(2)} \right) q^{-b_{r,n-s}+2r} \right) \tag{6.10} \\
&\geq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \left(1 - \frac{3}{2} \left(1 + D''_{n-s,s} \frac{1}{4} \right) q^{-b_{r,n-s}+2r} \right) \notag
\end{align}$$

And therefore

$$D'_{n,s} \geq \frac{3}{2} \left(1 + D''_{n-s,s}/4 \right) \geq \begin{cases} 3/2 & \text{for } 2s \leq n < 3s, \\ 31/16 & \text{for } 3s \leq n < 4s, \\ 7/2 & \text{for } 4s \leq n, \text{ but } (n,s) \neq (8,2). \end{cases}$$

For $(n,s) = (8,2)$, we adapt (6) according to Proposition 6.4 and need

$$D'_{8,2} \geq \frac{3}{2} \left(1 + D''_{6,2} q^{-v_{r,6,2}(1)+v_{r,6,2}(3)+1} \right).$$

With $-v_{r,6,2}(1) + v_{r,6,2}(3) + 1 = -b_{r-1,4} - r + 1 \leq -6$ we have

$$D'_{8,2} \geq \frac{3}{2} \left(1 + \frac{8}{3} q^{-6} \right)$$

such that the bound $7/2 > 25/16$ suffices.

The case $n < 2s$ is even simpler. Inequality (6) holds with $Q_{r,n-s,s} = \emptyset$ and the claimed inequality is true with $D'_{n,s} = 0$. ☐

Remark 6.11. Note that the exponent in the error term of the upper bound of Proposition 6.4 always exceeds the exponent in the lower bound of Proposition 6.5. The difference is exactly $\frac{1}{2}r(r-1)$ independently of n or s if $(n,s) \neq (6,2)$ and at least that much if $(n,s) = (6,2)$.

Theorem 6.12. *With the notation of Theorem 6.2, we have*

$$|\#Q_{r,n,s}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \eta_{r,n,s}(q)| \leq \begin{cases} \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \cdot 6q^{-\delta} & \textit{if } (n,s) \neq (6,2), \\ \eta_{r,6,2}(q) \cdot 3q^{-\binom{r+3}{4}-r+1} & \textit{if } (n,s) = (6,2). \end{cases}$$

Proof. Combining Propositions (6.4) and (6.5) leaves us with

$$|\#Q_{r,n,s} - \eta_{r,n,s}(q)| \leq \eta_{r,n,s}(q) \cdot D_{n,s} q^{-\delta},$$

where

$$D_{n,s} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{for } n < 2s, \\ 2 & \text{for } 2s \leq n < 3s, \\ 6 & \text{for } 3s \leq n \text{ and } (n,s) \neq (6,2). \end{cases}$$

□

Remark 6.13. As noted in Remark 5.4 for reducible polynomials, the error term is (essentially) decreasing in the input size and exponentially decaying in any of the parameters r, n and $\log_2 q$, when the other two are fixed.

We conclude with some handy bounds for the exponent of the relative error.

Fact 6.14. *For $n \geq s \geq 2$ and $r \geq 2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} -\delta &\leq -r, \\ -\delta &\leq -(n^2 + 6n - 24)/8, \\ -\binom{r+3}{r-1} - r + 1 &\leq -r. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 6.15. In the bivariate case (von zur Gathen, 2008, Theorem 3.1) had as estimate for the quotient $\#Q_{2,n,s}(\mathbb{F}_q)/\#P_{2,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ (using our notation) the term

$$q^{-(2ns-s^2+3s-4)/2} \frac{(1+q^{-1})(1-q^{-n+s-1})}{1-q^{-n-1}},$$

which equals the term $\eta_{2,n,s}(q)/\#P_{2,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ derived from our analysis above.

Remark 6.16. This confirms the result established in Theorem 6.2, since the exponent of q is just the same.

7 Relatively irreducible polynomials

A polynomial over F is called *relatively irreducible* if it is irreducible but factors over some extension field of F and *absolutely irreducible* otherwise. We define

$$\begin{aligned} E_{r,n}(F) &= \{f \in P_{r,n}(F) : f \text{ is relatively irreducible}\}, \\ A_{r,n}(F) &= I_{r,n}(F) \setminus E_{r,n}(F). \end{aligned}$$

In the remainder of the section, all fields F are assumed to be finite. For a given field extension $\mathbb{F}_{q^k}$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of degree k, we consider the Galois group $G_k = \mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k} : \mathbb{F}_q) \cong \mathbb{Z}_k$. G_k acts on $\mathbb{F}_{q^k}[x]$ coefficientwise. The map generating elements of $E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_{r,n,k} : P_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k}) &\to P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q), \\ g &\mapsto \prod_{\sigma \in G_k} g^\sigma, \end{aligned}$$

defined for all $k \neq 1$ dividing n. To check that this map is well-defined, it is enough to note that $(\varphi(g))^\tau = \varphi(g)$ for any $\tau \in G$ and therefore $\varphi(g) \in P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$.

In contrast to the situation for reducible and powerful polynomials we only have

$$E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \subseteq \bigcup_{1 \neq k \mid n} \operatorname{im} \varphi_{r,n,k},$$

since some $\varphi_{r,n,k}(g)$ may be reducible.

Lemma 7.1. *$\varphi_{r,n,k}(g)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_q$ if and only if $g \in P_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k})$ is irreducible and there is no $s < k$ such that $g \in P_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^s})$.*

Proof. The first restriction from arbitrary to irreducible polynomials is obvious. But this is not the only necessary condition. If some irreducible polynomial has only coefficients from a subfield of $\mathbb{F}_{q^k}$, say $g \in P_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^s})$ for some $s < k$ dividing k, then some g^σ for different $\sigma \in G_k$ will be equal. Take for the smallest such s

$$h = \prod_{\tau \in G_s} g^\tau \in I_{r,ns/k}(\mathbb{F}_q)$$

and note that $h^{k/s} = \varphi_{r,n,k}(g)$. Hence $\varphi_{r,n,k}(g)$ is a (k/s)th power and therefore reducible.

These two conditions are also sufficient, since the k conjugates g^σ, with $\sigma \in G_k$, are pairwise non-associate unless and only unless the coefficients are contained in some proper subfield of $\mathbb{F}_{q^k}$. ☐

Furthermore, we want to avoid some duplicates right from the start. If g is relatively irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_{q^k}$, then we can increase k to an appropriate multiple j and choose $h \in P_{r,n/j}(\mathbb{F}_{q^j})$ with the same image $\varphi_{r,n,k}(g) = \varphi_{r,n,j}(h)$ in $P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and the additional condition that h is absolutely irreducible. Therefore, we exclude relatively irreducible polynomials from the sources of the $\varphi_{r,n,k}$, because there is always an absolutely irreducible one of smaller degree with coefficients from a larger field that gives the same image.

Taking all the previous considerations into account, we restrict $\varphi_{r,n,k}$ to the following set

$$I^+_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k} : \mathbb{F}_q) = I_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k}) \setminus \Big(E_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k}) \cup \bigcup_{1 \neq s \mid k} (I_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^{k/s}}) \cap I_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k})) \Big),$$

where the first and last set on the right-hand side are motivated by Lemma 7.1 and the set in the middle to avoid the duplicates described above. Furthermore we define for all $k \neq 1$ dividing n the image of the restriction as

$$E_{r,n,k} = \varphi_{r,n,k}\left(I^+_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k} : \mathbb{F}_q) \right).$$

These sets are pairwise disjoint and finally constitute

$$E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \bigcup_{1 \neq k \mid n} E_{r,n,k}. \tag{7.2}$$

To get an upper bound for the size of $E_{r,n,k}$ we note that, $\varphi_{r,n,k}(g) = \varphi_{r,n,k}(h)$, if and only if $h = g^\sigma$ for some automorphism $\sigma \in G_k$, and hence the size of each fibre of $\varphi_{r,n,k}$ is

$$\# G_k = k.$$

Our conditions ensure $g \neq g^{\sigma}$ for all $g \in I^{+}_{r,n/k}$ and $\sigma \in G_k$ with $\sigma \neq \mathrm{id}$. Therefore

$$\# E_{r,n,k} = \frac{1}{k} \# I^{+}_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k} : \mathbb{F}_q). \tag{7.3}$$

Similar to Section 4, let $\mathcal{E}_n$ denote the polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}(\mathsf{q})$ corresponding to $E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ and define for any divisor k of n

$$\begin{aligned} w_{r,n}(k) &= \deg(\mathcal{P}_{n/k}(\mathsf{q}^k)) \\ &= k(b_{r,n/k} - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Using falling factorials we understand $w_{r,n}(k)$ as defined for real values k.

Lemma 7.4. *Let n be composite and ℓ the smallest prime factor of n.*

(i) As k runs through all divisors of n greater than 1, the value of $w_{r,n}(k)$ is strictly decreasing and $w_{r,n}(\ell)$ is maximal among all $w_{r,n}(k)$ for k a divisor of n different from 1.

(ii) If $(n, r) \neq (4, 2)$, then $w_{r,n}(\ell + 1) \geq w_{r,n}(k)$ for all divisors k of n greater than ℓ.

Proof. We modify $w_{r,n}(k)$ by adding the strictly increasing linear function k and multiplying by $r!$, thus considering

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}(k) &= (w_{r,n}(k) + k) \cdot r! \\ &= k(n/k + r)^{\underline{r}} \end{aligned}$$

as a function of the real variable k. Monotonicity for $\bar{w}(k)$ proves monotonicity for $w_{r,n}(k)$ and we compute directly

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{w}'(k) &= (n/k + r)^{\underline{r}} - \frac{n}{k} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \frac{(n/k + r)^{\underline{r}}}{n/k + i} \\ &= (n/k + r)^{\underline{r}} \left(1 - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \frac{1}{1 + i\frac{k}{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

If $r \geq 3$, then

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq r} \frac{1}{1 + i\frac{k}{n}} \geq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq 3} \frac{1}{1 + i} > 1,$$

for all $1 < k < n$, which proves $\bar{w}'(k) < 0$ and all claims.

If $r = 2$, then analogously $\bar{w}'(k) < 0$ for $1 < k < n/2$ and we compute directly

$$w_{2,n}(n/2) = \frac{5}{2} n > 2n = w_{2,n}(n)$$

to prove (i). For (ii) the monotonicity on $[1, n/2]$ along with $w_{2,n}(n/2) > w_{2,n}(n)$ is sufficient if $\ell + 1 \leq n/2$, which is true for all composite $n \neq 4$. ☐

The approach by generating functions gives the following result.

Theorem 7.5. *Let $r, n \geq 2$, let ℓ be the smallest prime divisor of n, and*

$$\epsilon_{r,n}(\mathsf{q}) = \mathsf{q}^{\ell(\binom{r+n/\ell}{r}-1)} \frac{1-\mathsf{q}^{-\ell\binom{r-1+n/\ell}{r-1}}}{\ell(1-\mathsf{q}^{-\ell})},$$

$$\gamma_{r,,n}(\mathsf{q}) = \begin{cases} 1/2 & \text{if } n=4, r \leq 4, \\ 3/2 & \text{if } n=4, r=5, \\ \mathsf{q}^{r(r-5)/2} & \text{if } n=4, r \geq 6, \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then the following hold.

(i) If n is prime, then

$$\mathcal{E}_n = \epsilon_{r,n}(\mathsf{q}) \left(1 - \mathsf{q}^{-r(n-1)} \frac{(1-\mathsf{q}^{-r})(1-\mathsf{q}^{-n})}{(1-\mathsf{q}^{-1})(1-\mathsf{q}^{-nr})} \right).$$

(ii) If n is composite, then

$$\mathcal{E}_n = \epsilon_{r,n}(\mathsf{q}) \left(1 - \gamma_{r,n}(\mathsf{q}) \cdot \mathsf{q}^{-\ell(\binom{r-1+n/\ell}{r-1}-r)} (1 + O(\mathsf{q}^{-1})) \right).$$

Proof. From the previous discussion we obtain

$$\#A_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \sum_{k|n} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{s|k} \mu(s) \; \#I_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^s}).$$

As a consequence,

$$\begin{aligned} \#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) &= (\#I_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \#A_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)) \\ &= - \sum_{1 \neq k|n} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{s|k} \mu(s) \; \#I_{n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^s}), \end{aligned}$$

When $n = \ell$ is prime, then $\#E_{r,\ell} = \frac{1}{\ell}\left(\#I_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell}) - \#I_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_q)\right)$. The result follows since all the polynomials of degree 1 are irreducible, so we have an exact formula after using equation (2).

When n is composite, the main asymptotic contribution comes from the least value of k that divides n (that is $k = \ell$), and for this value of k the sum in s has only two terms ($s = 1$ and $s = \ell$). As a consequence we have $\#E_{r,n} \sim \frac{1}{\ell}\left(\#I_{r,n/\ell}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell}) - \#I_{r,n/\ell}(\mathbb{F}_q)\right)$, where when $n \neq 4$ the main asymptotic contribution comes from $\#I_{n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell})$. Since $\#I_{n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell}) = \#P_{n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell}) - \#R_{n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell})$, we use (2) and Theorem 4.2, to find the asymptotic expansion of $\#I_{n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell})$, and prove the theorem.

When $n = 4$ (and so $\ell = 2$), we have three cases. When $r \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ the second order contribution comes from $\#R_2(\mathbb{F}_{q^2})$, and the result follows after using (2) and Theorem 4.2. When $r \geq 6$ the main second order contribution comes from $\#I_{r,2}(\mathbb{F}_q)$, that is asymptotically equivalent to $\#P_{r,2}(\mathbb{F}_q)$. When $r = 5$ both, $\#R_2(\mathbb{F}_{q^2})$ and $\#I_{r,2}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ contribute, giving the constant $3/2$ in front of the second order term. □

The combinatorial approach starts with the following simple observation.

Table 4: Exact values of $\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ for small values of r, n:

n	$\#E_{2,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$
1	0
2	$1/2\,q^4 - 1/2\,q$
3	$1/3\,q^6 + 1/3\,q^3 - 1/3\,q^2 - 1/3\,q$
4	$1/2\,q^{10} + 1/4\,q^8 - 1/2\,q^5 - 1/2\,q^4 + 1/4\,q^2$
5	$1/5\,q^{10} + 1/5\,q^5 - 1/5\,q^2 - 1/5\,q$
6	$1/2\,q^{18} + 1/2\,q^{16} + 1/3\,q^{15} - 1/3\,q^{12} - 1/2\,q^{10} - 1/2\,q^9 - 1/2\,q^8 + 1/6\,q^6$ $+1/6\,q^5 - 1/6\,q^4 - 1/6\,q^3 + 1/3\,q^2 + 1/6\,q$
n	$\#E_{3,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$
2	$1/2\,q^6 + 1/2\,q^4 - 1/2\,q^3 - 1/2\,q$
3	$1/3\,q^9 + 1/3\,q^6 - 1/3\,q^2 - 1/3\,q$
4	$1/2\,q^{18} + 1/2\,q^{16} + 1/2\,q^{14} + 1/4\,q^{12} - 1/2\,q^9 - 3/4\,q^8 - 1/2\,q^7 - 3/4\,q^6$ $+1/2\,q^3 + 1/4\,q^2$
5	$1/5\,q^{15} + 1/5\,q^{10} + 1/5\,q^5 - 1/5\,q^3 - 1/5\,q^2 - 1/5\,q$

Proposition 7.6. *Let $r, q \geq 2$, and $\epsilon_{r,n}(q)$ as in Theorem 7.3, then*

(i)

$$\#E_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_q) = 0,$$

and

(ii) for n prime

$$\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 - q^{-r(n-1)}\frac{(1-q^{-r})(1-q^{-n})}{(1-q^{-1})(1-q^{-nr})}\right)$$

$$0 \leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q) - \#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq 3q^{-r(n-1)}.$$

Proof. The first statement is obvious, since linear polynomials never split. For the second one we derive directly from (7) with $E_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_{q^n}) = \emptyset$ as noted above and with (7)

$$\begin{aligned}
\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) &= \#E_{r,n,n} \\
&= \#\varphi_{r,n,n}\left(I^+_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_{q^n} : \mathbb{F}_q)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\#I^+_{r,1}\left(\mathbb{F}_{q^n} : \mathbb{F}_q\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\#\left(I_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_{q^n}) \setminus \left(E_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_{q^n}) \cup \bigcup_{1\neq s|n}\left(I_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_{q^{n/s}}) \cap I_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_{q^n})\right)\right)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\#\left(I_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_{q^n}) \setminus I_{r,1}(\mathbb{F}_q)\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\left(q^{nr}\frac{1-q^{-nr}}{1-q^{-n}} - q^r\frac{1-q^{-r}}{1-q^{-1}}\right) \\
&= q^{nr}\frac{1-q^{-nr}}{n(1-q^{-n})}\left(1 - q^{-r(n-1)}\frac{(1-q^{-r})(1-q^{-n})}{(1-q^{-1})(1-q^{-nr})}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last fraction is not more than $32/15 < 3$. $\square$

Determining the size of $E_{r,n,k}$ will not always be that easy. We derive from (7)

$$\begin{aligned}
\#E_{r,n,k} &= \frac{1}{k}\#I^{+}_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k}:\mathbb{F}_q) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{k}\#P_{r,n/k}(\mathbb{F}_{q^k}) \\
&= q^{w_{r,n}(k)}\frac{1-q^{-kb_{r-1,n/k}}}{k(1-q^{-k})},
\end{aligned} \tag{7.7}$$

with

$$w_{r,n}(k) = k(b_{r,n/k}-1)$$

as defined in Lemma 7.2.

Proposition 7.8. *Let n composite, ℓ the smallest and k_0 the second smallest divisor of n greater than 1, and $\epsilon_{r,n}(q)$ as in Theorem 7.3. Then the following upper bounds hold:*

(i) For $n = \ell^2$

$$\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 + q^{-\ell(b_{r,\ell}-1)+\ell^2 r}\right)$$

for all $r \geq 2$.

(ii) For $n = 6$

$$\#E_{r,6}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \epsilon_{r,6}(q)\left(1 + 2q^{-r(2r^2-3r+5)/6}\right)$$

for all $r \geq 2$.

(iii) For $n = 12$ and $r = 2$

$$\#E_{2,12}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \epsilon_{2,12}(q)\cdot\left(1 + \frac{67}{64}q^{-12}\right).$$

(iv) For n and r satisfying either

- *$n = 12$ and $r \geq 3$,*
- *$n = 6N$, $N \geq 3$ and $r \geq 2$ or*
- *$k_0 \geq \ell + 2$ and $\ell \leq \sqrt{6n/7} - 1.5$ and $r \geq 2$*

we have

$$\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)(1 + 2q^{-\ell b_{r-1,n/\ell}}),$$

(v) For all other comosite n:

$$\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)(1 + 2q^{-\ell(b_{r,k_0}-1)+k_0(b_{r,\ell}-1)})$$

for all $r \geq 2$.

Lemma 7.9. *Let $n \neq 4, 6$ be composite and ℓ its smallest divisor greater than 1. Then*

$$\omega_{r,n} = l(b_{r,n/l-1}-1) - k_0(b_{r,n/k_0}-1) - n/6 + 1$$

is strictly increasing in $r \geq 2$.

Proof. Consider the difference $\omega_{r,n} - \omega_{r-1,n} = \ell b_{r,n/\ell-2} - k_0 b_{r,n/k_0-1}$. It is nonnegative if and only if

$$\frac{\ell(n/\ell - 2 + r)^{\underline{r}}}{k_0(n/k_0 - 1 + r)^{\underline{r}}} \geq 1. \tag{7.10}$$

We start a proof by induction with $r = 2$. The quotient simplifies to

$$\frac{(n-\ell)k_0}{\ell(n+k_0)}$$

which is greater or equal than 1 if and only if

$$n(k_0 - \ell) \geq 2\ell k_0. \tag{7.11}$$

This is true in the case of $k_0 = \ell + 1$, where it simplifies to $n \geq 12$ – easily true, since we excluded $n = 6$. For the case $k_0 \geq \ell + 2$ we distinguish two cases. Note, that the second smallest divisor k_0 is equal to n if and only if $n = \ell^2$. Otherwise $k_0 \leq \sqrt{n} < n$. Now, see on the one hand $n \neq \ell^2$ implies $k_0 \leq \sqrt{n}$ and therefore $2\ell k_0 < 2\sqrt{n}\sqrt{n} \leq (k_0 - \ell)n$. On the other hand $n = \ell^2$ implies $k_0 = \ell^2 = n$ and we reduce (7) to $\ell \geq 3$ which is satisfied, since we excluded $n = 4$.

Now for the induction step. The quotient on the left-hand side of (7) differs for r from the one for $r - 1$ by the factor

$$\frac{n/\ell - 2 + r}{n/k_0 - 1 + r}.$$

This is greater or equal than 1 if and only if

$$n(k_0 - \ell) \geq \ell k_0.$$

But this is certainly satisfied, since we already proved the stronger condition (7). □

Remark 7.12. The conclusion of Lemma 7.6 is false for $n = 4$.

Proof. From (7) we get using (7)

$$\begin{aligned}
\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) &\leq \sum_{1 \neq k | n} \#E_{r,n,k} \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \neq k | n} q^{w_{r,n}(k)} \cdot \frac{1 - q^{-kb_{r-1,n/k}}}{k(1 - q^{-k})} \\
&\leq q^{w_{r,n}(\ell)} \frac{1 - q^{-\ell b_{r-1,n/\ell}}}{\ell(1 - q^{-\ell})} + \sum_{\ell < k | n} q^{w_{r,n}(k)} \frac{1 - q^{-kb_{r-1,n/k}}}{k(1 - q^{-k})}.
\end{aligned}$$

An upper bound on $\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ is therefore given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1+q^{-w_{r,n}(\ell)}\sum_{\ell<k\mid n} q^{w_{r,n}(k)}\frac{\ell(1-q^{-\ell})(1-q^{-kb_{r-1,n/k}})}{k(1-q^{-k})(1-q^{-\ell b_{r-1,n/\ell}})}\right)\\
&\leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1+q^{-w_{r,n}(\ell)}\sum_{\ell<k\mid n} q^{w_{r,n}(k)}\frac{(1-q^{-\ell})(1-q^{-kb_{r-1,n/k}})}{(1-q^{-\ell b_{r-1,n/\ell}})(1-q^{-k})}\right)\\
&\leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1+q^{-w_{r,n}(\ell)}\sum_{\ell<k\mid n} q^{w_{r,n}(k)}\right), \qquad (7.13)
\end{aligned}$$

since $(1-q^{-k})/(1-q^{-kb_{r-1,n/k}})$ is monotone increasing with k.

For the first three claims we compute directly from (7)

$$\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1+q^{-\ell(b_{r,\ell}-1)+\ell^2 r}\right)$$

for $n=\ell^2$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\#E_{r,6}(\mathbb{F}_q) &\leq \epsilon_{r,6}(q)\left(1+q^{-2(b_{r,3}-1)}\left(q^{3(b_{r,2}-1)}+q^{6(b_{r,1}-1)}\right)\right)\\
&= \epsilon_{r,6}(q)\left(1+q^{-2(b_{r,3}-1)+3(b_{r,2}-1)}\left(1+q^{-3r(r-1)/2}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $1+q^{-3r(r-1)/2}\leq 9/8$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\#E_{2,12}(\mathbb{F}_q) &\leq \epsilon_{2,12}(q)\left(1+q^{-2(b_{2,6}-1)}(q^{3(b_{2,4}-1)}+q^{4(b_{2,3}-1)}+q^{6(b_{2,2}-1)}+q^{12(b_{2,1}-1)})\right)\\
&= \epsilon_{2,12}(q)\left(1+q^{-12}(1+q^{-6}+q^{-12}+q^{-18})\right)\\
&\leq \epsilon_{2,12}(q)\left(1+(1+3q^{-6})q^{-12}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $1+3q^{-6}\leq 67/64$.

Note that the conditions on n in the first two cases of (iv) are equivalent to $k_0=\ell+1$ and $n\neq 6$, since $\ell\geq 3$ would imply $\ell+1$ even and hence 2 as a divisor of n, therefore contradicting the minimality of ℓ.

In order to show for (iv) that the relative error on the right-hand side of (7) satisfies

$$q^{-w_{r,n}(\ell)}\sum_{\ell<k\mid n} q^{w_{r,n}(k)} \leq 2q^{-\ell b_{r-1,n/\ell}}$$

we use $K=\{k:\ell<k\mid n\}$ to show

$$q^{-\ell(b_{r,n/\ell}-1)}\#Kq^{k_0(b_{r,n/k_0}-1)}\leq 2q^{-\ell b_{r-1,n/\ell}}$$

or even with the very coarse bound $\#K\leq n-2\leq 2^{n/6}\leq 2q^{n/6-1}$

$$n/6-1+k_0(b_{r,n/k_0}-1)\leq \ell(b_{r,n/\ell-1}-1).$$

This last inequality is satisfied, if and only if the function $\omega_{r,n}$ as defined in Lemma 7.6 is nonnegative. By this lemma it is enough to consider the minimal r for that.

In the first case of (iv) the bound (7) follows from $\omega_{3,12} = 7 > 0$. Note that $\omega_{2,12} < 0$. In the second case with $n = 6N$ we compute

$$\omega_{2,n} = 3N^2 - 7N - 1,$$

where the larger root of the quadratic polynomial is less than 3 and therefore $\omega_{2,n} \geq 0$ for $N \geq 3$. Finally in the third case we compute for $k_0 \geq \ell + 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_{2,n} &= \ell(b_{2,n/\ell-1} - 1) - k_0(b_{2,n/k_0} - 1) - n/6 + 1 \\
&= \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\ell} - \frac{1}{k_0}\right) n^2 - \frac{7}{6}n + 1 - \ell \\
&\geq \frac{1}{\ell(\ell+2)}n^2 - \frac{7}{6}n + 1 - \ell.
\end{aligned}$$

Let n_2 be the largest real root of the quadratic polynomial in n on the right-hand side. If $\ell \leq \sqrt{6n/7} - 1.5$, then

$$n \geq \frac{7}{6}(\ell + 1.5)^2 \geq \frac{7}{6}\left(\ell(\ell+2) + \sqrt{\ell^2(\ell+2)^2 + \tfrac{144}{49}(\ell+1)\ell(\ell+2)}\right) = n_2$$

and therefore $\omega_{2,n} \geq 0$.

What are the parameters covered in (v)? We have $n \neq \ell^2$, $k_0 \geq \ell + 2$ and $\ell > \sqrt{\frac{6n}{7}} - 1.5$. This boils down to $n = \ell k_0$, k_0 prime or $n = 8$, since by the first condition we have at least two distinct prime factors. If we have exactly two, then $n = \ell k_0$, if we have more than two, then $n \geq \ell^3$ and by requiring

$$\frac{7}{6}(\ell + 1.5)^2 \geq n \tag{7.14}$$

it follows as necessity

$$-\ell^3 + \frac{7}{6}(\ell + 1.5)^2 \geq 0$$

where the largest root of the cubic polynomial on the left-hand side is between 2 and 3. With the only choice $l = 2$ follows $14 \geq n$ from (7) and therefore only two possibilites for n with at least three factors: $n = 12$ (contradicting $k_0 \geq \ell + 2$) and $n = 8$. Anyways $n = \ell k_0$ holds and we get from (7) as upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 + q^{-\ell(b_{r,k_0}-1)}(q^{k_0(b_{r,\ell}-1)} + q^{n(b_{r,1}-1)})\right) \\
&\leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 + q^{-\ell(b_{r,k_0}-1)+k_0(b_{r,\ell}-1)}(1 + q^{-k_0(b_{r,\ell}-1)+n(b_{r,1}-1)})\right) \\
&\leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 + 2q^{-\ell(b_{r,k_0}-1)+k_0(b_{r,\ell}-1)}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 7.15. *With the notation of Proposition 7.5 we have*

(i) for $n = 4$

$$\#E_{r,4}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \epsilon_{r,4}(q)\left(1 - q^{-(r^2+3r-6)/2}\right),$$

(ii) and else

$$\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 - q^{-(\ell-1)(b_{r-1,n/\ell}-r)}\right).$$

Proof. For any composite n we have

$$\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \#E_{r,n,\ell}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \frac{1}{\ell}\#I^+_{r,n/\ell}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell} : \mathbb{F}_q) \geq \frac{1}{\ell}\left(\#I_{r,n/\ell}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell}) - \#I_{r,n/\ell}(\mathbb{F}_q)\right), \tag{7.16}$$

since ℓ is prime and there are no proper intermediate fields between $\mathbb{F}_q$ and $\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell}$.

For composite numbers $n \neq 4$ is equivalent to $n/\ell \geq 3$. For $n/\ell \geq 4$ inequality (7) yields with the lower bound on the number of irreducible polynomials from Corollary 5.5:

$$\begin{aligned}
\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \frac{1}{\ell}\Big(&\#P_{r,n/\ell}(\mathbb{F}_{q^\ell}) - \rho_{r,n/\ell}(q^\ell)(1 + 3q^{\ell(-b_{r-1,n/\ell-1}+b_{r-1,2})}) \\
&-\#P_{r,n/\ell}(\mathbb{F}_q) + \rho_{r,n/\ell}(q)(1 - 3q^{-b_{r-1,n/\ell}+b_{r-1,2}})\Big) \\
\geq{}& \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\,(1 - q^{-\ell(b_{r-1,n/\ell}-r)}\frac{(1-q^{-\ell r})(1-q^{-\ell})(1+3q^{-\ell(b_{r-1,n/\ell-1}-b_{r-1,2})})}{(1-q^{-\ell b_{r-1,n/\ell}})(1-q^{-\ell})^2} \\
&-q^{-(\ell-1)(b_{r,n/\ell}+1)}\frac{(1-q^{-b_{r-1,n/\ell}})(1-q^{-\ell})}{(1-q^{-\ell b_{r-1,n/\ell}})(1-q^{-1})}\Big) \\
\geq{}& \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 - q^{-\ell(b_{r-1,n/\ell}-r)}\frac{(1+3q^{-\ell(b_{r-1,n/\ell-1}-b_{r-1,2})})}{(1-q^{-\ell})}\right. \\
&\left.-q^{-(\ell-1)(b_{r,n/\ell}+1)}\frac{(1-q^{-\ell})}{(1-q^{-1})}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{7.17}$$

Both exponents of q are dominated by $-(\ell-1)(b_{r-1,n/\ell}-r)$ and the two fractions are bounded by $7q^{-3}/3$ and $2q^{-13}$ respectively, so that a lower bound is given by

$$\epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 - q^{-(\ell-1)(b_{r-1,n/\ell}-r)}\right).$$

For $n/\ell = 3$ the corresponding bound from Corollary 5.5 only changes the bounds for the corresponding fractions in the analog of (7) which now reads

$$\epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 - q^{-\ell(b_{r-1,3}-r)}\frac{(1+2q^{-\ell r(r-1)/2})}{(1-q^{-\ell})} - q^{-(\ell-1)(b_{r,3}+1)}\frac{(1-q^{-\ell})}{(1-q^{-1})}\right).$$

Both exponents are again bounded by $-(\ell-1)(b_{r,n/\ell}-r)$ and the fractions by $2q^{-2}$ respectively $2q^{-9}$, such that item (ii) holds.

Note, that on closer inspection it is possible to determine for each pair of parameters n and ℓ two intervals for r, where one exponent in (7) dominates the other. This allows tighter bounds at the cost of further case distinctions.

Finally for $n = 4$ the exact result of Corollary 5.5 gives with the same argument as before

$$\begin{aligned}
\#E_{r,4}(\mathbb{F}_q) &\geq \epsilon_{r,4}(q)\left(1 - q^{-r(r-1)}\frac{(1-q^{-2r})}{2(1-q^{-2})} - q^{-r(r+3)/2}\frac{(1-q^{-2})}{(1-q^{-1})}\right) \\
&\geq \epsilon_{r,4}(q)\left(1 - q^{-(r^2+3r-6)/2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

since $-(r^2+3r-6)/2 \geq \max(-r(r-1), -r(r+3)/2)$ for all $r \geq 2$.

□

Remark 7.18. To combine the upper bounds from Proposition 7.5 with the lower bounds from Proposition 7.8 we have to compare the relative errors. Starting with the most general situation we find the exponent of q in the relative error for the lower bound to be larger by at least $(\ell-1)r+b_{r-1,n/\ell}$ than the exponent in the upper bound, assuming $n/\ell \geq 4$ and the conditions of Proposition 7.5(i), (iv) or (v). For the remaining $n = 4, 6$ and 9, the exponent of q for the relative error of the lower bound is at least as much as its counterpart of the upper bound, but exceeds only by $(r-2)(r-3)/2$, $r(r-3)^2/6$ and $r(r+1)(r+13)/6$ respectively.

Theorem 7.19. *In the notation of Theorem 7.3, the following holds.*

(i) If n is prime, then

$$\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) = \epsilon_{r,n}(q)\left(1 - q^{-r(n-1)}\frac{(1-q^{-r})(1-q^{-n})}{(1-q^{-1})(1-q^{-nr})}\right)$$

(ii) If $n \neq 4$ is composite, then

$$|\#E_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \epsilon_{r,n}(q)| \leq \epsilon_{r,n}(q) \cdot 2q^{-\ell(b_{r-1,n/\ell}-r)},$$

where the 2 can be omitted unless $n = 6$.

(iii) For $n = 4$, we have

$$|\#E_{r,4}(\mathbb{F}_q) - \epsilon_{r,4}(q)| \leq \epsilon_{r,4}(q) \cdot q^{-(r^2+3r-6)/2}.$$

Remark 7.20. Comparing Theorem 7.10 to the bivariate results of von zur Gathen (2008) we find $\#E_{2,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)/\#P_{2,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ approximated by

$$\frac{q^{-n^2(\ell-1)/(2\ell)}(1-q^{-1})}{\ell(1-q^{-\ell})(1-q^{-n-1})}.$$

This differs from $\epsilon_{2,n}(q)/\#P_{2,n}(\mathbb{F}_q)$ only by a factor of $1 - q^{-(\ell+n)}$.

Corollary 7.21. *Let $r, q, n \geq 2$, $\rho_{r,n}(q)$ as defined in (4.2) and $\epsilon_{r,n}(q)$ as in Theorem 7.3, then*

$$\#I_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq \#A_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) \geq P_{r,n}(\mathbb{F}_q) - 2(\rho_{r,n}(q) + \epsilon_{r,n}(q)).$$

Remark 7.22. Comparing this result to Theorem 7.3, we find the main terms equal.

8 Acknowledgments

Joachim von zur Gathen and Alfredo Viola thank Philippe Flajolet for useful discussions about Bender's method in analytic combinatorics of divergent series in April 2008. The work of Joachim von zur Gathen and Konstantin Ziegler was supported by the B-IT Foundation and the Land Nordrhein-Westfalen.

References

ARNAUD BODIN. Number of irreducible polynomials in several variables over finite fields. *American Mathematical Monthly*, **115**(7):653–660, 2008. ISSN 0002-9890.

ARNAUD BODIN. Generating series for irreducible polynomials over finite fields, 2009. URL `http://arxiv.org/abs/0910.1680v2`. Accessed 10 December 2009.

LEONARD CARLITZ. The distribution of irreducible polynomials in several indeterminates. *Illinois Journal of Mathematics*, **7**:371–375, 1963.

LEONARD CARLITZ. The distribution of irreducible polynomials in several indeterminates II. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, **17**:261–266, 1965.

STEPHEN COHEN. The distribution of irreducible polynomials in several indeterminates over a finite field. *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Mathematical Society*, **16**:1–17, 1968.

PHILIPPE FLAJOLET & ROBERT SEDGEWICK. *Analytic Combinatorics*. Cambridge University Press, 2009. ISBN 0521898064.

SHUHONG GAO & ALAN G. B. LAUDER. Hensel Lifting and Bivariate Polynomial Factorisation over Finite Fields. *Mathematics of Computation*, **71**(240):1663–1676, 2002.

JOACHIM VON ZUR GATHEN. Counting reducible and singular bivariate polynomials. *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, **14**(4):944–978, 2008. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ffa.2008.05.005`. Extended abstract in *Proceedings of the 2007 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation ISSAC2007,* Waterloo, Ontario, Canada (2007), 369-376.

XIANG-DONG HOU & GARY L. MULLEN. Number of Irreducible Polynomials and Pairs of Relatively Prime Polynomials in Several Variables over Finite Fields. *Finite Fields and Their Applications*, **15**(3):304–331, 2009. URL `http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ffa.2008.12.004`.

DONALD E. KNUTH. Two notes on notation. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, **99**(5):403–422, 1992. URL `http://arxiv.org/abs/math/9205211`.

DAQING WAN. Zeta Functions of Algebraic Cycles over Finite Fields. *Manuscripta Mathematica*, **74**:413–444, 1992.